UNIVERSITÉ DE MONTRÉAL

CENTRE DE RECHERCHE SUR LES TRANSPORTS

CASE POSTALE 6128, SUCCURSALE A, MONTRÉAL, QUÉBEC, H3C 3J7

CRT-579

VEHICLE ROUTING WITH STOCHASTIC DEMANDS: MODELS AND ISSUES

by

Moshe Dror*
Gilbert Laporte**
Pierre Trudeau**

* INRS-Telecommunications, Montréal.

** Centre de recherche sur les transports, Université de Montréal.

Cette étude a été publiée grâce à une subvention du fonds F.C.A.R. pour l'aide et le soutien à la recherche.

Université de Montréal
Centre de recherche sur les transports - Publication #579
June 1988

Dépôt légal - 2e trimestre 1988

ABSTRACT

This paper considers the vehicle routing problem with stochastic demands. The objective is to provide an overview of this problem, and examine a variety of solution methodologies. First, for this class of problems, the concepts and the main issues are analyzed and some properties of optimal solutions are examined. Two solution frameworks for the problem are described: stochastic programming and Markov decision processes. The existing mathematical programming formulations are then presented and compared and a new formulation is proposed.

Key words : vehicle routing problem; stochastic programming; Markov decision process.

RÉSUMÉ

On considère, dans cet article, des problèmes de tournées avec demandes stochastiques. Le but est de donner un aperçu général de cette classe de problèmes et d'étudier diverses approches de solution. On analyse d'abord divers concepts et questions reliés à ces problèmes et on s'intéresse à certaines propriétés des solutions optimales. Deux cadres de résolution sont présentés : la programmation stochastique et les processus de décision markoviens. On passe ensuite en revue les formulations de programmation mathématique courantes et on propose une nouvelle formulation.

Mots-clés : problèmes de tournées; programmation stochastique; processus de décision markoviens.

1. INTRODUCTION

The classical *vehicle routing problem* (VRP) can be defined as follows. Consider a set $N = \{0, 1, ..., n\}$ of cities or customers, a depot located at city 0 and a distance matrix $C = (c_{ij})$ defined on N^2. The c_{ij}'s can also be interpreted as costs or travel times. Non-negative weights (or single commodity demands) ξ_i are associated with the cities of $N \setminus \{0\}$. In addition, there is a fleet of identical vehicles of capacity Q at the depot which service the set $N \setminus \{0\}$. The VRP consists of determining vehicle routes in such a way that (i) all routes start and end at the depot; (ii) each city other than the depot is visited exactly once ; (iii) the total demand of any given route does not exceed Q; (iv) the total distance travelled by all vehicles is minimized. The VRP is an important problem in the area of distribution - logistics, but only small problem instances (expressed in terms of n) can be solved optimally. There exists an extensive literature on the VRP and on several of its variants. Comprehensive recent surveys can be found in Christofides (1985) and Laporte and Nobert (1987).

The classical VRP statement does not capture an important aspect of real-life distribution problems, namely that several of the problem parameters (time-distances, city locations, demands, fleet size, etc.) are often *stochastic*. Moreover in practice, several operating and service policies and a number of objective criteria can be considered. Whereas in the deterministic case the problem setting is clear, this is less so when the stochastic nature of problem parameters is taken into account. Until now much less effort has been devoted to the study of *stochastic vehicle routing problems* (SVRPs) as opposed to their deterministic counterparts. This is due, we believe, to the fact that when stochastic elements are introduced into this difficult combinatorial problem, it becomes in general even less tractable by analytical treatment.

The objective of this paper is to survey the work done so far on the VRP with stochastic demands, while clarifying some of the concepts and issues involved. We examine properties of the optimal solutions and propose a new solution framework and a new integer programming model for the problem. The paper is organized as follows.

In Section 2 we describe the problem and solution characteristics, and examine the problem parameters, operating and service policies, as well as solution properties. In Section 3 we present the solution framework for the SVRP separating it into stochastic programming and Markov process. In Sect' n 4 we describe and comment on a number of old and new mathematical programming formulations. Section 5 contains the conclusions.

2. PROBLEM AND SOLUTION CHARACTERISTICS

2.1 Problem Scope

We assume that customers have known and fixed locations, that the problem is defined on a complete graph, and that the distance matrix C satisfies the triangular inequality ($c_{ik} + c_{kj} \geq c_{ij}$ for all i, j, k). The assumption of a complete graph eliminates from the discussion a number of important related studies restricted to special graph structures such as trees (see for example, Berman and Simchi-Levi (1986) and Berman et al. (1988)).

We also assume that *all* customers have to be visited and fully serviced. This excludes from consideration the class of *probabilistic traveling salesman problems* studied by Derman and Klein (1966), Jaillet (1985) and Jaillet and Odoni (1988). The problem examined by Derman and Klein was that of determining an optimal inspection sequence for n components. It was characterized by the cost of inspecting component j after component i and by the required inspection frequency for each component. The objective was to minimize the expected inspection cost per unit time. Derman and Klein called this problem the *stochastic traveling salesman problem.* The name *probabilistic traveling salesman problem* was used by Jaillet (1985) for problems in which only a random subset of customers have to be visited. The subset of customers is determined according to a known probability distribution and these are always visited in the same sequence. The problem consists of determining a visiting sequence for all customers which minimizes expected travel distance.

Also excluded are problems in which the c_{ij}'s are random variables. Such problems occur, for example, in the context where the c_{ij}'s are travel times which may vary according to traffic conditions. For the study of the estimated value for the expected length of an optimal traveling salesman problem (TSP) tour, see Leipala (1978). For the problem of determining the least expected travel time path between two customers see Hall (1986).

2.2 Operating Policies

We consider problems with a single given depot, a homogeneous fleet and where customer demand is the only source of uncertainty. Our problem is therefore a particular case of the SVRP, although we will continue to refer to it by the SVRP abbreviation throughout the paper. Demands ξ_i are discrete or continuous non-negative random variables, assumed to be independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) with finite means μ_i and finite variances σ_i^2. The fact that the demand is not deterministic introduces a major structural change into the problem. It is no longer possible to assume, as was the case in the deterministic VRP, that vehicle routes can be followed as planned. Indeed a *failure* may occur on a planned route if, at some point (customer) along that route, customer demand cannot be met by the vehicle. In such a case, some recourse or corrective action which may require extra cost must be taken. For example, the vehicle may have to return to the depot, reload and go back to the customer where failure occurred or a new routing sequence may have to be planned for the remaining customers (route reoptimization). Another possibility would be to break the planned vehicle routes at various points in order to reduce the expected cost of corrective actions based on the anticipated demand of the customers. A *break* implies that at some point the vehicle returns to the depot for replenishment before it resumes its deliveries. These "route breaks" do not have to coincide with route failures. The range of recourse options is clearly wide and is dependent upon the acceptable service policy and the amount of available information on customer demand. (On this subject, see Laporte and Louveaux, 1987.) These options will be examined in the next subsection.

The SVRP consists of determining a first stage solution, i.e., planned vehicle routes, taking into account the appropriate recourse actions. Often the information on customer demands is revealed gradually as vehicles follow their planned routes, so it may not be appropriate to divide the problem into "first stage costs" and "second stage costs". The SVRP should be viewed as a multi-stage problem. The number of stages is sometimes equal to the number of customers, but as will be seen later, it can also exceed that number and cannot always be known a priori. This will be clarified when we examine the service policies for the SVRP in the next subsection. The characterization of the SVRP as a multi-stage problem brings up the issue of reoptimization. Since new information is learned at each stage, one may want to benefit from this by reconsidering the customer sequence designed in the first stage.

A large range of reoptimization actions can be considered as valid operating policies. At one extreme, the original path must be followed. If a route failure occurs, the vehicle goes to the depot for replenishment and resumes its journey at the failure point. In less restrictive operating policies, reoptimizations are possible but only upon route failures. At the other end of the range, one may reoptimize at any location, using the newly obtained data about customer demand. Breaks are a form of reoptimization. They can be planned a priori in the first stage, or they can be decided on the basis that when facing an imminent route failure, it may be better to go back to the depot for replenishment before visiting the next customer. Finally, note that the first stage assignment need not be simply a sequence of customers but may also include reoptimization instructions in the form of a decision tree for each stop on the route.

2.3 Service Policies

In the VRP case, we distinguish between two major service policies: (i) *full delivery*: whenever a vehicle arrives at a customer, it delivers all that customer's demand. Hence, it is necessary in this case, to make the additional assumption that $\xi_i \leq Q \quad (i = 1,...,n)$, for otherwise, the problem is infeasible. This service policy is

the most widely used in the VRP literature (see, for example, Laporte and Nobert, 1987); (ii) *split delivery*: here, customer demand can be supplied by several vehicles or split between several visits of the same vehicle: the assumption that a customer is visited exactly once (by exactly one vehicle) no longer holds and it is not necessary to assume that $\xi_i \leq Q$ $(i = 1, \ldots, n)$. This policy constitutes in fact a relaxation of the first case. Another possibility belonging to this category is when demand can be split, but only in prespecified fractions. The split delivery VRP has been less widely studied. For recent papers on this subject, see Dror and Trudeau (1988) and Dror et al. (1988).

In order to examine the major service policies in the case of the SVRP, an important attribute is the time at which customer demand becomes known. There are two extreme cases: (i) *full advance information :* all demands are known before vehicle routes are planned, which leads to the VRP; (ii) *late information :* customer demand becomes known only after the vehicle arrives at the customer's location, which leads to the SVRP. This case can be further split into two: the demand is known immediately before delivery or immediately after full service is completed (for example, in fuel delivery). Between these two extremes, there is a whole spectrum of possibilities (i.e., demand becomes known one, two, three steps ahead, etc.).

For the SVRP, the *full delivery* service policy implicitly assumes that the demand becomes known after the vehicle arrives at the customer's location but before delivery. The *split delivery* service policy for the SVRP is more complicated. If no service preemption is allowed, then in the case of late information, the split delivery is determined by the demand and the quantity left on the vehicle at arrival (i.e., if the delivery has started, it will end when either the full demand is delivered or the vehicle becomes empty). If service preemption is allowed, then new decision variables have to be added. They determine the maximum level of replenishment on each visit to a customer.

Service policy and availability of information determine the number of stages in the SVRP. For example, in full advance information problems, there is only one stage;

in late information and full delivery problems, there are n stages; in the case of late information and split deliveries, there can be more than n stages.

2.4 Solution Properties

In this subsection, we examine a number of properties of an optimal TSP solution and show that they do not translate to the SVRP.

PROPERTY 1 : For the Euclidian TSP, the shortest closed path through n given points never intersects itself (i.e., it is a simple polygon unless all the points are colinear).



Figure 1: Two basic geometric TSP properties do not translate to the SVRP.

For the SVRP the expected minimal cost vehicle tour does not, in general, correspond to a simple polygon. This is illustrated in Figure 1. The coordinates for the depot and the customers 1,2, and 3 are (0,0), (0,10), (-1,1), and (2,4) respectively. The distances between the points are computed using the Euclidian norm and there is only one vehicle of capacity 10. Customer 1 has a deterministic demand of 2 units. Customer 2 has a demand of 1 unit with probability 0.8 and demand of 8.2 units with probability of 0.2. Customer 3 has a demand of 2 units with probability of 0.8 and demand of 8.1 units with probability of 0.2. Assume that once the service sequence is set, no reoptimization is allowed when the demand values are revealed and no partial deliveries are allowed (i.e., we assume full service policy). In this case, it is simple to enumerate the routes and compute their expected values.

Route	**Expected distance**
(0,1,3,2,0)	24.32
(0,2,3,1,0)	30.17
(0,1,2,3,0)	29.76
(0,3,2,1,0)	34.73
(0,2,1,3,0)	30.70
(0,3,1,2,0)	29.72

The routing sequence (0,1,3,2,0) with the minimal expected value of 24.32 obviously does not possess the non-intersection property. Note that route direction has an impact on expected distance. A similar observation was made independently by Jaillet and Odoni (1988).

PROPERTY 2 : Every Euclidian TSP has an optimal solution in which customers on the boundary of the convex hull of all the customers (including the depot) are visited in the same order in which they appear on the boundary of the convex hull

(Flood, 1956).

Using the same example, it is clear from Figure 1 that this property does not hold for the SVRP. The next observation has a more serious repercussion on the design of SVRP algorithms.

PROPERTY 3 : In the case of the optimal TSP tour, the principle of optimality (usually stated in the context of dynamic programming) can easily be verified. It implies that any segment of an optimal TSP tour is optimal (i.e., if the sequence $i_0 = 0, i_1, ..., i_n, 0$ corresponds to the shortest simple cycle through the $n + 1$ points, then any subsequence, say $i_{p+1}, ..., i_{p+q}$, through $q < n + 1$ points also corresponds to the shortest simple path through these q points.)

The states in the dynamic programming version of the TSP correspond to the cities already visited and to the current position of the vehicle. In the case of the SVRP, the optimal vehicle tour has to account for all possible demand realizations which, under a certain service policy, could require redesigning a remaining segment of planned city visits. Thus, any segment of the initially designed optimal route would not necessarily be optimal when examined in isolation.

We illustrate this important distinction between the TSP and the SVRP in a special restricted case of tour construction. The restriction states that once a tour is selected, the sequence of the cities serviced remains fixed, (i.e., no reoptimization of the tour occurs). Figure 2 shows that in this case, a SVRP tour can be optimal in the sense that it minimizes the expected cost, but the segments of such a tour are not necessarily optimal when examined separately. Indeed, assume there are



Figure 2 : Segments of an optimal tour are not optimal for the SVRP.

three customers 1,2, and 3, and a depot at 0 located at (-5,5), (0,1), (5,5), and (0,0) respectively. The distances between the points are again Euclidian. Only customer 1 has a stochastic demand (1 unit with probability 0.5 and 9 units with probability 0.5). Customers 2 and 3 each have a deterministic demand of 2 units. The vehicle capacity is 10 units. Computing the expected distances for all tour configurations gives the following values:

Route	**Expected distance**
(0,1,2,3,0)	27.948
(0,3,2,1,0)	34.019
(0,1,3,2,0)	31.545
(0,2,3,1,0)	31.545
(0,2,1,3,0)	31.545
(0,3,1,2,0)	31.545

The optimal tour in terms of expected distance is $(0,1,2,3,0)$. The problem of segments not being optimal occurs once we reach the customer 1. If the demand at 1 is one unit, then the subsequent best decision is to continue to customer 3 followed by 2 and then the depot, with an expected added distance of 17.403 versus the original tour continuation which adds 19.877 to the distance. On the other hand if the demand at 1 is 9 units, then the best solution is to return to the depot and from there to go to customer 2 followed by 3 with an expected added distance of 21.545. If we attempt to follow the original tour, then the vehicle can only partially replenish customer 2, return to the depot then go back to 2 followed by 3, with an expected distance of 21.877. The third option of continuing from 1 to 3, with route failure at 3, return to the depot and then to 3 followed by 2 has an expected distance of 31.545. The optimal tour (0,1,2,3,0) would never be followed if reoptimization of the route was allowed.

3. SOLUTION FRAMEWORKS

In this section we describe the general stochastic programming framework and a Markov decision process description for the SVRP. For a general overview of stochastic programming, see Dempster (1980), Kall (1982) and Wets (1983). For a description of Markov decision processes, the reader is referred to Heyman and Sobel (1984).

3.1 Stochastic Programming

By a mathematical programming problem we usually understand a problem of the type

(MP) $\quad \min \ f(x)$

subject to:

$$g_i(x) \leq 0 \quad (i = 1, ..., m)$$

$$x \in S \subseteq R^n,$$

where the real functions $f, g_i (i = 1, ..., m)$ are assumed to be deterministic and known.

The stochastic counterpart can be described as

(SP) "min" $f(x, \xi)$

subject to:

$$g_i(x, \xi) \leq 0 \quad (i = 1, ..., m)$$

$$x \in S \subseteq R^n$$

where ξ is a vector of random variables defined on a probability space (Ω, Σ, P), hence $(f(x, \xi), g_i(x, \xi); i = 1, ..., m)$ is a random vector.

This stochastic programming problem is not well-defined in general since the objective of choosing $x \in S$ is not clearly specified in (SP). Thus, we have to specify the *solution concept* (Kall, 1982) appropriate for a particular problem. Stochastic programming terminology distinguishes between "wait and see" and "here and now" situations. The first leads to so called *distribution problems* by computing (selecting) the decision variables x (planned vehicle routes) after observing the realization of ξ (customer demands). The second ("here and now"), is the situation where the computation of x has to precede the observation of ξ. In the *distribution problem*, given a realization ξ of customer demands, we would have to solve a version of the *split delivery problem* in case split delivery is allowed (see Dror and Trudeau, 1988, and Dror et al., 1988) or the generic VRP if only full delivery is allowed. In essence, if $z(\xi)$ denotes the cost value of the optimal solution as a function of the demand vector ξ, then we may be interested in the distribution of $z(\xi)$, or at least in some of its moments. According to Kall (1982), this information could have important implications for the purpose of cash management over many periods.

The SVRP more naturally belongs to the "here and now" category since usually, routes have to be planned in anticipation of customer demands which become known only in the process of executing the planned routing sequence. Again, the prob-

lems in this category are usually modeled in two ways: so-called *chance constrained stochastic programming* and *stochastic programming with recourse*. We restate the general chance constrained formulation and the stochastic programming with recourse formulation as presented in Kall (1982).

(i) **Chance constrained programming**

(CCP) $\min E[f(x,\xi)]$

subject to:

$$x \in S$$

$$P(\{\xi | g_i(x,\xi) \leq 0, i = 1,...,m\}) \geq 1 - \alpha$$

or $$P(\{\xi | g_i(x,\xi) \leq 0\}) \geq 1 - \alpha_i \qquad (i = 1,...,m).$$

(ii) **Stochastic programming with recourse**

(SPR) $\min E[f(x,\xi) + \phi(x,\xi)]$

subject to:

$$x \in S$$

where $\phi(x,\xi)$ is some non-negative real function $H(g_i(x,\xi), i = 1,...,m)$ taking the value 0 if $g_i(x,\xi) \leq 0$ $(i = 1,...,m)$. This expresses the fact that if all the constraints are satisfied, then we are concerned with the value of the objective function only, but when a violation of the constraints occurs, we have to add a penalty $H(g_i(x,\xi); i = 1,...,m)$ to the objective value. In the SVRP, $\phi(x,\xi)$ corresponds to the cost of corrective or recourse action.

3.2 A Markov Decision Process Model

We now show how the SVRP can be modeled as a Markov decision process. While

our discussion is mainly descriptive, it provides a new insight into the problem.

Consider a SVRP with a single vehicle of fixed capacity Q located at the depot and assume that no customer demand exceeds Q. In addition, assume that the exact demand becomes known immediately upon arrival of the vehicle at the customer location (i.e., before replenishment begins). Given the vehicle arrived at a customer location, two possible decisions-actions can be taken prior to the start of the service:

(i) not replenish the customer and then move to another location (which could be another customer or the depot),

(ii) replenish the customer and then move to another location.

We assume a non-preemptive service policy which implies that if customer service (replenishment) has started, it is not interrupted until either the customer is fully replenished or the vehicle is empty, in which case the only option is to return to the depot. When there are no more customers to be replenished, then again the only option is to return to the depot. This is the final state of the system whereas in the initial state, there is a full vehicle at the depot with all n customers to be serviced.

The system is observed each time the vehicle arrives at one of the locations of $\{0,1,...,n\}$. Let $\tau_0 = 0, \tau_1, \tau_2, \ldots$ $(\tau_i \leq \tau_{i+1}; i = 0,1,2,....)$ be the times (total distance traveled by the vehicle) at which these events occur. Note that τ_i corresponds to the time of the i^{th} arrival which is not necessarily an arrival time at location i. These are called *transition times* and correspond to the times at which decisions are taken. The *state* of the system at a transition time τ_k is described by a vector $s = (r, l, x_1, ..., x_n)$, where $r \in \{0,1,...,n\}$ denotes the position of the vehicle and $l \in [0,Q]$ describes the stock level in the vehicle (if $r = 0$ then $l = Q$ i.e., the vehicle is full). If customer i has been visited, then the exact demand is known and x_i represents the remaining demand $(x_i \geq 0)$. If customer i has not been visited yet, then the demand is unknown and is denoted by $x_i = -1$. The *state space* is a subset S of $\{0,1,...,n\} \times [0,Q] \times (\{-1\} \cup [0,Q])^n$ which satisfies the above conditions.

At each transition time, a decision d is selected from the *decision space* D =

$\{d_1, d_2\} \times \{0, 1, ..., n\}$, where $d = (d_1, i)$, means that the vehicle goes to customer i from its present location, say j, without servicing j and $d = (d_2, i)$ corresponds to the case where the vehicle first replenishes j before going to i. The decision $d = (\cdot, i), (i \neq 0)$ is admissible even if $l = 0$, which represents the value of collecting the information on the demand at i without being able to satisfy any part of that demand. If $x_i = 1$ for all i, then the only admissible action is $d = (d_1, 0)$ i.e., returning to the depot. For each $s \in S$, let $D(s) \subset D$ denote the set of admissible decisions when the system is in state s, and $\Gamma = \{(s, d) | d \in D(s)\}$ the set of admissible state-decision pairs.

At transition time τ_k, the system is in some state $s_k \in S$ and a decision $d_k \in D(s_k)$ is taken. The time τ_{k+1} of the next transition is deterministic (specified by the distance matrix (c_{ij})), and the next state s_{k+1} is generated according to the probability distribution which governs the demand variables. Suppose $s_k = (r_{\tau_k}, l, x_1, ..., x_n,) \in S$ is the observed state at the current transition time τ_k, and $d \in D(s)$ is the decision taken. Then the time (distance) until the next event is simply the difference $\tau_{k+1} - \tau_k = c_{r_{\tau_k}, r_{\tau_{k+1}}}$ where r_{τ_k} is the location of the vehicle at transition time τ_k. (We implicitly assume that service time is zero.) Let $p(\cdot | s, d)$ be the transition law, that is for every Borel subset $\overline{S}$ of $S, p(\overline{S} | s, d)$ is the probability that the next state belongs to $\overline{S}$, given s and d.

A control policy is a function μ which associates with each state $s \in S$ a decision $d = \mu(s) \in D(s)$. The aim of the decision maker is to find a policy which minimizes the expected cost of a decision sequence, starting at $s_0 = (0, Q, -1, ..., -1)$ and terminating at $s^* = (o, Q, 0, ..., 0)$. More precisely, one seeks a policy μ^* which minimizes $E_\mu[\sum_{k=0}^{T} c_{r_{\tau_k}, r_{\tau_{k+1}}}]$ where T is the random number of transitions.

The problem can be characterized as a sequential decision process under uncertainty. Appropriate solution methodologies, both exact and approximate, for that class of problems can be found in Bertsekas (1987).

In the case where a preemptive service policy is allowed (i.e., a replenishment of a

customer can be stopped at any point of the service), then the decision space of the above model becomes much larger. The new decision space is $D = \{0, 1, ..., n\} \times [0, Q]$, where a decision d taken at point j has the form $d = (i, t_j)$ $(0 \leq t_j \leq x_j)$. The decision variables t_j determine the replenishment level at j. (Note that the previous decision variables d_1, d_2 are no longer required.)

4. MATHEMATICAL PROGRAMMING FORMULATIONS

4.1 Chance Constrained Models

Both the chance constrained formulation and the stochastic programming with recourse formulation have been used for the SVRP. Stewart and Golden (1983) propose the following chance constrained formulation which contains no expectation of the total distance in its objective. Let x_{ijk} be a binary variable equal to 1 if vehicle k travels from i to j, and equal to 0 otherwise. Also let m be the number of vehicles available, T_m the set of all feasible solutions to the m-TSP and α, the maximum allowable probability of route failure. The model is then:

(CCP1) $$\min z = \sum_k \sum_{i,j} c_{ij} x_{ijk} \qquad (1)$$

subject to:

$$P(\sum_{i,j} \xi_i x_{ijk} \leq Q) \geq 1 - \alpha \quad (k = 1, ..., m) \qquad (2)$$

$$x = (x_{ijk}) \in T_m. \qquad (3)$$

In this model, probabilistic constraints (2) can be replaced by the following non-linear deterministic constraints:

$$\sum_{i,j} \mu_i x_{ijk} + \tau(\sum_{i,j} \sigma_i^2 x_{ijk}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq Q \quad (k = 1, ..., m) \qquad (4)$$

where $\mu_i = E[\xi_i], \sigma_i^2 = \mathrm{Var}[\xi_i]$ and τ is some constant. Now let $M_k = \sum_{i,j} \mu_i x_{ijk}$ and $S_k = (\sum_{i,j} \sigma_i^2 x_{ijk}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Stewart and Golden show that provided (i) the ξ_i's are independent random variables, (ii) $\frac{(\sum_{i,j} \xi_i x_{ijk} - M_k)}{S_k}$ and $\frac{(\xi_i - \mu_i)}{\sigma_i}$ have the same distri-

bution for all i, and (iii) $\frac{\sigma_i^2}{\mu_i}$ is equal to the same constant θ for all i, then constraints (2) or (4) are equivalent to

$$\sum_{i,j} \mu_i x_{ijk} \leq \overline{Q} \quad (k = 1, ..., m) \tag{5}$$

where $\overline{Q} = \frac{2Q+\tau^2\theta-(\tau^4\theta^2+4Q\tau^2\theta)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2}$ i.e., the SVRP then reduces to a deterministic VRP with vehicle capacity equal to $\overline{Q}$.

Laporte et al. (1988) obtain a similar result by making less restrictive assumptions and by using fewer variables. They define two-index variables x_{ij} instead of three-index variables x_{ijk}, but their model cannot take into account varying vehicle capacities, as was the case in (CCP1). Let x_{ij} be a binary variable equal to 1 if and only if a vehicle travels on arc (i, j). Then the Laporte et al. model, adapted to the case of general distance matrices, can be written as:

$$\text{(CCP2)} \qquad \min z = \sum_{i,j} c_{ij} x_{ij} \tag{6}$$

subject to :

$$\sum_{i \in S, j \notin S} x_{ij} \geq V_\alpha(S) \qquad (S \subseteq \{1, ..., n\}; |S| \geq 2) \tag{7}$$

$$x = (x_{ij}) \in T_m. \tag{8}$$

Here $V_\alpha(S)$ is the minimum number of vehicles required to serve all customers of S so that the probability of route failure in S does not exceed α, i.e., $V_\alpha(S)$ is the smallest integer such that $P(\sum_{i \in S} \xi_i > QV_\alpha(S)) \leq \alpha$. The value of $V_\alpha(S)$ is easily determined provided the probability distribution of $\sum_{i \in S} \xi_i$ is known or even approximated for any non-empty subset S of $\{1, ..., n\}$. This model and that of corresponding deterministic VRP (Laporte et al., 1985) are equivalent.

Both these models minimize distance travelled while controlling the probability of route failure; however, the cost of such failures is not taken into account. They are not equivalent to minimizing the expected distance travelled while controlling the probability of route failure. Two routes with the same probability of route failure

and the same distance might have quite different expected distance values since the potential location of a failure has a significant impact on the expected route distance. Under appropriate assumptions, solving (CCP1) or (CCP2) involves the same level of difficulty as solving a deterministic VRP with the same parameters.

4.2 Recourse Models

For the stochastic model with recourse, Stewart and Golden (1983) propose the following formulation:

$$\text{(RM1)} \qquad \min z = \sum_k \sum_{i,j} c_{ij} x_{ijk} + \sum_k \lambda_k E[l_k] \qquad (9)$$

subject to:

$$x \in T_m. \qquad (10)$$

where λ_k is the penalty per unit of demand in excess of Q on route k and $E[l_k]$ is the expected number of units by which demand will exceed capacity on route k. In (RM1) the terms $\lambda_k E[l_k]$ do not reflect the true cost of an extra trip to the depot in case of route failure, since the location of failure is not taken into account.

In the stochastic models with recourse proposed by Laporte and Louveaux (1987), full service (i.e., no split deliveries) is assumed and two cases are considered: (i) in the SVRP with "early information", all customer demands are known after the route is constructed but before the vehicle leaves the depot and route breaks are planned in advance so as to minimize their expected cost; (ii) in the SVRP with "late information", breaks and failures coincide. In both cases, it is assumed that the planned routing sequence is unaltered by failures or breaks. The two models are restated below.

$$\text{(RM2)} \qquad \min z(x) = cx + \phi(x) \qquad (11)$$

subject to:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i0} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_{0j} \leq m \tag{12}$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n} x_{ij} = 1 \quad (j = 1, ..., n) \tag{13}$$

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n} x_{ij} = 1 \quad (i = 1, ..., n) \tag{14}$$

$$\sum_{i \in S} \sum_{j \notin S} x_{ij} \geq 1 \quad (S \subseteq \{1, ..., n\}, |S| \geq 2) \tag{15}$$

$$x_{ij} \in \{0, 1\} \qquad (i, j = 1, ..., n) \tag{16}$$

where $\phi(x)$ is the recourse function defined below. Denote by

z_{ij}^{ξ} = the commodity flow on arc (i, j) in the state of the world ξ.

w_{ij}^{ξ} = 1 if a break occurs on arc (i, j) in state ξ and 0 otherwise.

In the recourse model with early information, $\phi(x)$ is defined by

$$\phi(x) = E_{\xi}[\phi(x, \xi)] \tag{17}$$

where for all ξ,

$$\phi(x, \xi) = \min \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (c_{i0} + c_{0j} - c_{ij}) w_{ij}^{\xi} \tag{18}$$

subject to:

$$z_{ij}^{\xi} \leq Q x_{ij} \quad (i, j = 0, ..., n) \tag{19}$$

$$w_{ij}^{\xi} \leq x_{ij} \quad (i, j = 0, ..., n) \tag{20}$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n} z_{ji}^{\xi} - \sum_{i=0}^{n} z_{ij}^{\xi} \geq \xi_j - Q \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{ij}^{\xi} \quad (j = 1, ..., n) \tag{21}$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n} z_{ji}^{\xi} \geq \xi_j - Q(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{ij}^{\xi}) \quad (j = 1, ..., n) \tag{22}$$

$$z_{ij}^{\xi} \geq 0 \text{ and } w_{ij}^{\xi} \in \{0, 1\} \text{ for all } i, j. \tag{23}$$

In the late information model, the recourse function has the form

$$\phi(x, \xi) = \min \sum_{i=1}^{n} (c_{i0} + c_{0i}) w_i^{\xi} \tag{24}$$

where $w_i^\xi = 1$ if a route failure ($\equiv$ route break) occurs at i in state ξ and $w_i^\xi = 0$ otherwise. The remaining constraints are similar to those of the early information model except that they ensure that route failures and route breaks coincide. Laporte and Louveaux (1987) also present lower and upper bounds for their two models. These are based on the solutions of related easier deterministic models.

A different approach to SVRP as a stochastic recourse problem was presented in Dror and Trudeau (1986). Denote that approach as (RM3). The recourse function $\phi(x,\xi)$ in the event of route failure is assumed to take the value of back and forth trips from the depot to each of the remaining customers on the initial route. Note that this type of recourse function eliminates the issue of reoptimizing the remaining route segments after a route failure and in fact, it penalizes heavily the occurrence of route failure on a planned route. The objective criterion is to minimize the expected value of distance plus the recourse value, subject to the routing constraints. The actual solution procedure was based on heuristic route construction adapted from the deterministic VRP heuristic introduced by Clarke and Wright (1964), in which the decision whether to combine two routes with customers i and j respectively into a single route depended on the savings value $s_{ij} = c_{0i} + c_{0j} - c_{ij}$ and the feasibility of such an operation. In (RM3), the savings term is replaced by $\max\{c_i' + c_j' - c_{ij}', c_i' + c_j' - c_{ji}'\}$, where c_i' is the expected cost of the current route including i and c_{ij}' is the expected cost of the combined route where i immediately precedes j. This kind of heuristic route construction accounts for the location of potential route failures, the direction of the route, and the customers already supplied on that route. The computational experiments reported in Dror and Trudeau (1986) suggest that their approach is successful in constructing vehicle routes with considerably lower expected routing cost than either (CCP1) or (RM1).

As mentioned earlier, when modeling the SVRP as a stochastic programming problem with recourse, it is important to recognize that the problem is not a two-stage program as is sometimes suggested, but a more general multi-stage stochastic program. Whenever exact demands become known (e.g. upon arrival of a vehicle at a

customer site), a new set of decision variables can in principle be generated reflecting the objective of minimizing the expected cost. The number of such stages is at least equal to the number of customers in the SVRP, but it may be even larger depending on the service policy assumed. For instance, if the vehicle cannot fully supply a customer, it may lead to a number of stages in excess of the number of customers. To our knowledge, this type of a general multi-stage stochastic programming problem has received little attention so far and is usually considered computationally intractable. Linear programming multi-stage stochastic problems have been addressed by Birge (1985).

It should be clearer at this point that for a general routing problem with stochastic demands it is difficult to express the objective of minimizing the expected distance value in a closed tractable form.

4.3 A New Recourse Model

The three recourse models presented so far address similar SVRP settings. In (RM1) and (RM2), no route reoptimization is permitted, only full deliveries are allowed and the demands ξ_i are assumed to be independent identically distributed random variables. In (RM1), the objective does not represent the exact expected cost of the solution and the location at which route failure occurs is not accounted for (i.e., the back and forth distance which the vehicle has to travel in order to resume its route). In (RM2), the location of route failure (route break) is accounted for in the recourse penalty function. The problem is that this function (expressed by $\phi(x)$) is implicitly defined and its evaluation may require the solution of a very large number of optimization problems, especially in case of continuous demand distributions. In (RM3), the recourse penalty eliminates the reoptimization option (limiting the number of route failures to at most one per route), forcing the vehicle to empty its load at the point of failure.

In this section we present a mathematical programming formulation of the SVRP under the same service policy as (RM3), without reoptimization and where demands

ξ_i are i.i.d. random variables. This formulation has the following properties:

(i) the expected cost of the solution accounts for the location of route failures;

(ii) the number of variables is independent of the number of demand realizations;

(iii) in the event that a vehicle cannot fully replenish a customer, it empties its load and travels back and forth to the depot before resuming its route which might include a number of additional failures.

We will first examine the recourse function in this problem setting. Assume a planned route is denoted by $x = (0, i_1, ..., i_n, 0)$. Its recourse cost has the following value (Trudeau and Dror, 1987):

$$\phi(x,\xi) = \sum_{k=1}^{n}(c_{0i_k} + c_{i_k 0})\sum_{j=1}^{k} P[\sum_{l=1}^{k-1}\xi_{i_l} \leq jQ < \sum_{l=1}^{k}\xi_{i_l}]$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{n}(c_{0i_k} + c_{i_k 0})\sum_{j=1}^{k}(P[\sum_{l=1}^{k-1}\xi_{i_l} \leq jQ] - P[\sum_{l=1}^{k}\xi_{i_l} \leq jQ])$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{n}(c_{0i_k} + c_{i_k 0})\sum_{j=1}^{k}(F_{k-1}(j) - F_k(j)) \qquad (25)$$

where

$$F_k(t) = \begin{cases} P[\sum_{l=1}^{k}\xi_{i_l} \leq tQ] \cdot & if \quad k \in \{1,...,n\} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Note that index k in the first sum of (25) refers to customer i_k; index j corresponds to the j^{th} route failure (occurring at customer i_k).

In this model, we assume for the sake of simplicity that the cumulative demand distributions are characterized by two parameters. We require that these two parameters be obtained additively from the parameters of the individual demand distributions of ξ_i. For example, when the variables ξ_i are normally distributed with mean μ_i and variance σ_i^2, then their cumulative demand distribution is also normal and has two parameters, each obtained additively from those of the individual demand distributions, i.e., $\sum_{i=1}^{n}\xi_i \sim N(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mu_i, \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sigma_i^2)$. Similarly, if $\xi_i \sim \Gamma(\alpha_i, \beta)$ then $\sum_{i=1}^{n}\xi_i \sim \Gamma(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\alpha_i, \beta)$. In case of the gamma distribution, only the first parameter is additive. In the case where ξ_i can take negative values (e.g. if ξ_i is normally dis-

tributed) it is assumed that the distribution parameters are such that $P[\xi_i < 0] \simeq 0$. If no split deliveries are allowed, it is also assumed that these parameters are such that $P[\xi_i \leq Q] \simeq 1$. The model is of course usable if the demand distribution has only one parameter (e.g. Poisson and exponential distributions) and is easy to expand if it has more than two parameters.

In developing (25), we assumed that the routing sequence of customers is known and therefore the parameters of the cumulative demand distribution up to and including customer i can be easily calculated. In general, the optimal sequence is unknown and in order to obtain the parameter values for the cumulative demand distribution up to node i, we introduce a commodity flow variable for each parameter. On arc (i,j), the flow variable u_{ij} is used to accumulate the first parameter of the cumulative demand and the v_{ij} serves the same purpose for the second parameter of this cumulative demand.

In order to simplify the presentation of the objective function, we introduce four variables $y_i^1, y_i^2, r_i^1, r_i^2$. They are defined as follows:

$$y_i^1 \equiv \sum_{k=0}^{n} u_{ki};\ y_i^2 \equiv \sum_{k=0}^{n} u_{ik};\ r_i^1 \equiv \sum_{k=0}^{n} v_{ki};\ r_i^2 \equiv \sum_{k=0}^{n} v_{ik} \quad (i = 1,...,n)$$

Let η_i^1 and η_i^2 denote the first and the second parameters of the demand distribution at i and define $F(j,y,r)$ as the value of the cumulative demand distribution evaluated at jQ with parameter values y and r.

The problem is then:

(RM4)

$$\min z = \sum_{i=0}^{n}\sum_{j=0}^{n} c_{ij}x_{ij} + \sum_{i=1}^{n}(c_{0i} + c_{i0})\sum_{j=1}^{n}[F(j,y_i^1,r_i^1) - F(j,y_i^2,r_i^2)] \quad (26)$$

subject to:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{0i} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_{j0} = 1 \quad (27)$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n} x_{ij} = 1 \qquad (j = 1,...,n) \quad (28)$$

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n} x_{ij} = 1 \qquad (i = 1, \ldots, n) \tag{29}$$

$$\sum_{i \in S} \sum_{j \notin S} x_{ij} \geq 1 \quad (S \subseteq N, |S| \geq 2) \tag{30}$$

$$x_{ij} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \text{for all } i, j \tag{31}$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n} u_{jk} = \sum_{i=0}^{n} u_{ij} + \eta_j^1 \qquad (j = 1, \ldots, n) \tag{32}$$

$$u_{ij} \leq \eta_i^1 x_{ij} \text{ and } u_{ij} \geq 0 \quad (j = 0, \ldots, n) \quad \text{if } \eta_i^1 \geq 0 \quad (i = 1, \ldots, n) \tag{33}$$

$$u_{ij} \geq \eta_i^1 x_{ij} \text{ and } u_{ij} \leq 0 \quad (j = 0, \ldots, n) \quad \text{if } \eta_i^1 < 0 \quad (i = 1, \ldots, n) \tag{34}$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n} v_{jk} = \sum_{i=0}^{n} v_{ij} + \eta_j^2 \quad (j = 1, \ldots, n) \tag{35}$$

$$v_{ij} \leq \eta_i^2 x_{ij} \text{ and } v_{ij} \geq 0 \ (j = 0, \ldots, n) \text{ if } \eta_i^2 \geq 0 \quad (i = 1, \ldots, n) \tag{36}$$

$$v_{ij} \geq \eta_i^2 x_{ij} \text{ and } v_{ij} \leq 0 \ (j = 0, \ldots, n) \text{ if } \eta_i^2 < 0 \quad (i = 1, \ldots, n) \tag{37}$$

$$u_{0j} = v_{0j} = 0 \qquad (j = 1, \ldots, n). \tag{38}$$

The first term of (26) represents the a priori planned regular tour. Since no reoptimization is allowed, the costs associated with it will be incurred, independently of the number of route failures that may occur. The second term is the recourse function which was obtained in (25). Note that in the second summation, index j goes up to n (instead of i) since we do not know in advance the sequence of customers up to i in the optimal solution. Constraints (27) - (31) ensure connectivity and flow conservation. Note that (27) - (31) are identical to (12) - (16) except for (27) which imposes only one vehicle. Constraints [(32)-(34),(38)] and [(35) - (38)] are two similar blocks which respectively describe the commodity flow variables u_{ij} and v_{ij} related to the two parameters of the cumulative demand distribution function F. Describing only the first block, we see that (33), (34) impose that commodity flows are non-zero only on planned routes. By (32), the flow leaving customer j is equal to the flow entering customer j plus the value of the first parameter of the demand distribution of customer i (recall the additivity hypothesis). Therefore, y_i^1 and y_i^2 will be the accumulated values of the first parameter on the route up to node i, respectively

excluding and including the value of the first parameter for customer i. Note that constraints (30) may often not be required. Constraints (32) by themselves could sometimes prevent the formation of subtours. This would be the case for instance if for all j, η_j^1 (or η_j^2) were of the same sign.

This model can be generalized in a straightforward manner. To deal with for more than one vehicle, one simply has to replace "1" by "m" in (27). Preplanned route breaks can also be incorporated in a similar fashion. In the case where the ξ_i's are normally distributed, (25) has the following form:

$$\phi(x,\xi) = \sum_{k=1}^{n}(c_{0i_k} + c_{i_k 0})\sum_{j=1}^{k}[F(\frac{jQ-\sum_{l=1}^{k-1}\mu_{i_l}}{(\sum_{l=1}^{k-1}\sigma_{i_l}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}) - F(\frac{jQ-\sum_{l=1}^{k}\mu_{i_l}}{(\sum_{l=1}^{k}\sigma_{i_l}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}})]$$

where $F(t) = P[Z \leq t]$, and $Z \sim N(0,1)$. Thus, $F(j,y,r)$ in (26) is simply $P[Z \leq \frac{jQ-y}{r^{\frac{1}{2}}}]$ and $\eta_j^1 = \mu_j, \eta_j^2 = \sigma_j^2$.

The new model presented in this subsection is of general applicability whenever the operating policy is such that no reoptimization is allowed. It should be noted however that its objective function may not have a closed form representation and is in general non-linear.

5. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have considered a class of SVRPs where all customers have to be visited and where customer demand is the only source of uncertainty. Because of the large number of potential operating and service policies, and the possible variations in the availability of demand information, it becomes clear that the variety of problems is this setting is much larger than in the deterministic case. Furthermore, it is demonstrated that some elementary properties of deterministic VRPs no longer hold in the stochastic case.

The present status of research into problems in the SVRP category is not very impressive. Only a limited number of mathematical programming formulations and

exact algorithms have been proposed for VRPs with stochastic demands and these only apply to a small number of problem settings. As such, versions of chance constrained programming formulations which minimize planned route costs while controlling the probability of failure can be shown to be equivalent to deterministic VRP formulations. In recourse programming formulations, on the other hand, the number of integer variables necessary to account for the possible demand realizations increases problem size and difficulty substantially. So far, such formulations have been proposed for very particular problem settings and have not produced exact algorithms.

In addition to providing an overview of the SVRP, this paper proposes two new solution frameworks. The first one models the problem as a Markov decision process. The second one is an integer programming formulation where the number of variables is independent of the possible demand realizations and can be used to model problems with relatively general recourse functions. Its major disadvantage is the non-linearity of the objective function and the restrictive operating and service policy it assumes. At present, the value of these two new solution frameworks is mainly descriptive. Further research is required to explore the two new modeling avenues presented here.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to thank Professor Pierre L'Ecuyer from Laval University for his comments on the Markov decision process model. The first two authors acknowledge the support of the Canadian National Sciences and Engineering Research Council (grants OGPIN 020 and A4747).

REFERENCES

Berman, O. and Simchi-Levi, D. (1986). "Minisum location of a traveling salesman", **Networks** 16, 239-254.

Berman, O., Simchi-Levi, D. and Tamir, A. (1988). "The minimax multistop location problem on a tree", **Networks** 17, 39-49.

Bertsekas, D.P., DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING: DETERMINISTIC AND STOCHASTIC MODELS, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1987.

Birge, J.R. (1985). "Decomposition and partitioning methods for multistage stochastic linear programs", **Operations Research** 33, 989-1007.

Clarke, C. and Wright, J.W. (1964). "Scheduling of vehicles from a central depot to a number of delivery points", **Operations Research** 12, 568-581.

Dempster, M.A.H. (ed.), STOCHASTIC PROGRAMMING, Academic Press, Inc., London, 1980.

Derman, C. and Klein, M. (1966). "Surveillance of multi-component systems: a stochastic traveling salesman's problem", **Naval Research Logistics Quarterly** 13, 103-111.

Dror, M., Laporte, G. and Trudeau, P. (1988). "Exact solutions to split delivery routing", (forthcoming).

Dror, M. and Trudeau, P. (1986). "Stochastic vehicle routing with modified savings algorithm", **European Journal of Operational Research** 23, 228-235.

Dror, M. and Trudeau, P. (1988). "Savings with split delivery routing", **Transportation Science**, (to appear).

Flood, M.M. (1956). "The traveling-salesman problem", **Operations Research** 4, 61-75.

Hall, R.W. (1986). "The fastest path through a network with random time-dependent travel times", **Transportation Science** 20, 182-188.

Heyman, D.P. and Sobel, M.J., STOCHASTIC MODELS IN OPERATIONS RESEARCH, Vol. II, McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, 1984.

Jaillet, P. (1985). "Probabilistic Traveling Salesman Problem", Ph.D. Thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Jaillet, P. and Odoni A.R. (1988). "The probabilistic vehicle routing problem", in B.L. Golden and A.A. Assad., eds., VEHICLE ROUTING: METHODS AND STUDIES", **Studies in Management Science and Systems 16**, North-Holland Publishing, Amsterdam, 293-318.

Kall, P. (1982). "Stochastic Programming", **European Journal of Operational Research** 10, 125-130.

Laporte, G. and Louveaux, F. (1987). "Formulations and bounds for the stochastic capacitated vehicle routing problem with uncertain supplies", Cahier du GERAD G-87-23, Ecole des Hautes Etudes Commerciales de Montreal.

Laporte, G., Louveaux, F. and Mercure, H. (1988). "Models and exact solutions for a class of stochastic location-routing problems", **European Journal of Operational Research**, (in press).

Laporte, G. and Nobert, Y. (1987). "Exact algorithms for the vehicle routing problem", in S. Martello, G. Laporte, M. Minoux and C. Ribeiro, eds., SURVEYS IN COMBINATORIAL OPTIMIZATION, **Annals of Discrete Mathematics 31**, North-Holland Publishing, Amsterdam, 147-184.

Laporte, G., Nobert, Y. and Desrochers, M. (1985). "Optimal routing under capacity and distance restrictions", **Operations Research** 33, 1050-1073.

Lawler, E.L., Lenstra, J.K., Rinnooy Kan, A.H.G. and Shmoys, D.B. (eds.). THE

TRAVELING SALESMAN PROBLEM, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, 1985.

Leipala, T. (1978). "On the solutions of stochastic traveling salesman problems", **European Journal of Operations Research** 2, 291-297.

Stewart, W.R., Jr. and Golden, B.L. (1983). "Stochastic vehicle routing: A comprehensive approach", **European Journal of Operational Reasearch** 14, 371-385.

Trudeau, P. and Dror, M. (1987). "Stochastic inventory routing: stockouts and route failure", (submitted for publication).

Wets, R. (1983). "Stochastic programming: solution techniques and approximation schemes", in A. Bachem, M. Grotschel, and B. Korte, eds., MATHEMATICAL PROGRAMMING: STATE OF THE ART 1982, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 566-603.